



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"This method carries the atmosphere of a president's cabinet, where wise men freely confer and compare opinion, and then decide, rather than that of a congress where men fight and force issues.

"Of course, in the transaction of ordinary routine business it is not important to use this method. It is only with questions of importance on which notable divergence of opinion arises, that it has its special value.

"This has come back to mind in the present connection merely because the method tends to make the faculty a constituent part of the administration in the form of a cabinet of advisers to the chief executive. This I think is really worth more to them than a vote or two on behalf of one of the four parties. It gives the members of the faculty a feeling of greater individual participation in the management of affairs than is likely to come to them through representation as party of the fourth part."

COMMENT ON PROFESSOR CHAMBERLAIN'S LETTER BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE T.—

"1. The writer seems to have misconstrued, in certain important respects, the scope and purport of the report in question. The report was prepared under difficult conditions. During the period of its incubation the Committee was handicapped by the distractions incidental to the relations of the United States to the Great War. Many of its members were actively engaged in various sorts of home service. Under normal circumstances the wide geographical distribution of the members of such a committee would be a serious handicap and the actual circumstances were abnormal. It seemed best not to attempt completeness and finality, but rather to indicate briefly some of the main problems and standpoints and to suggest various ways of meeting the problems. The report distinctly purports to offer only a basis for further discussion. My own view is that it would be undesirable for a committee of this kind to attempt to formulate now a complete and water-tight scheme of faculty participation in university administration. Conditions are too various and things are too much in flux in the field of higher education. It is desirable that experiments should be made with various plans of faculty participation.

"2. The report is not in any sense a dissertation on the faults and virtues of trustees, presidents, or faculties. I regard Professor Chamberlain's remark that the report is silent on the virtues of trustees as wholly irrelevant to the aim of the report.

"3. The statement is made in connection with the contention that faculties tend to be antagonistic to the development of new fields of higher education, especially in science, that—"This is occultly revealed in the report, but it is marshalled under terms of "quality *versus* quantity," as is usually done when the real issue lies between the old and the new.' This is a misinterpretation of that part of the report, which I wrote. I do not believe that any member of our committee is hostile to the development of new fields of education and research in science or elsewhere. Certainly I am not. What I had in mind was the fact that large numbers of students are coming to the Universities with certificates of graduation from high schools without adequate preparation or serious purpose. Ten years' service on the Executive Committee of the College of Arts of my own university has convinced me that this statement is not an exaggeration. Frequent exchange of ideas with colleagues in other institutions has convinced me that my own university is not peculiar in this respect. The almost indiscriminate admission of preparatory school graduates involves a considerable waste of time, energy, and money. What the remedy may be is another question.

"4. Professor Chamberlain says that the fourth party to the educational business consists of the faculties,—"The technicians who do the skilled work in the educational shop.' He seems to question the competency of party No. 4 to participate in the management of the business. I think it is unfortunately true that a good many faculty members do function almost entirely as shop technicians. This, I suppose, is a consequence of the excessive departmentalization into which we have run. Departments are necessary. Nevertheless I regard it as disastrous when members of faculties neither attempt to nor are given incentive to think, debate, and act effectively on broad questions of educational polity and philosophy. It seems to me a *university professor*, in distinction from a mere pedagogical technician, should esteem it one of his most precious privileges and paramount duties to think out problems of educational polity.

"5. Professor Chamberlain's account of the method devised by him while at Madison for conducting faculty business is very interesting and suggestive. I very much doubt whether it would work satisfactorily in a faculty with three or four hundred voting members. In large faculties it seems to me much better that smaller executive committees and special committees *ad hoc* should work out plans for dealing with important matters and that their reports should be submitted in print a reasonable time before these reports come up for action.

"6. I am skeptical in regard to faculty membership on Boards of Trustees. It seems to me to involve confusion of functions. But I am strongly of the opinion that, in our larger and more complex universities, it is desirable, when important questions of policy come up, that they should be settled after conference between committees representing the faculties and the trustees. I could cite from my own experience a number of instances in which this method has ironed out difficulties and avoided misunderstandings. Certainly a president's hands are strengthened if the trustees know that he has the faculty with him in a matter of policy.

"7. Professor Chamberlain is right in saying that the task of weeding out incompetency is a serious difficulty in university administration. It is unfortunately true that many faculty members pursue a *laissez faire* policy in such matters. If the faculties are unwilling to shoulder their share of responsibility in such matters they have no business to ask for a part in administration. It was not the intention of our committee to erect a barrier against action in this difficult matter. It dealt only with procedure in appointments and promotions, on the assumption that to formulate procedure in removals was part of the business of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The latter committee has already formulated some principles on this matter and will doubtless make further recommendations. In fact I have accepted membership on the latter committee with special reference to procedure in dismissals.

"8. Professor Chamberlain is undoubtedly right in saying that Trustees, as representatives of the public which supports higher education, 'are likely to be quite as good judges of what is of real worth in life as those who dwell more largely in the classic

shades.' For this reason I contend that there should be frequent opportunity for interchange of views between trustees and faculties. The ideal way would be for the entire board of trustees to meet the entire Faculty and discuss with it questions of educational policy. Since this does not seem to be practicable, owing to the fact that most trustees are non-residents and very busy men, and that faculties are very large in our great universities, is it not desirable that chosen representatives of faculties should discuss such matters with the trustees? I doubt whether presidents are, as a rule, capable of invariably conveying adequately to the trustees the prevailing views of the faculty and of invariably conveying adequately to the Faculty the views of the trustees."—*J. A. Leighton*.

UNIVERSITY MORALE.—"If members of the governing board use the university corruptly for personal or political gain, if they are dishonest in institutional contracts, if they try to control book adoptions, if they interfere unjustly in the discipline of students so that there is one law for those who have influence and another for those who have not, if they allow churches, or parties, or powerful men to influence faculty appointments and dismissals, if they suppress the freedom of teaching, if in any way they discourage the finest things for which the university exists and encourage the things existing in it which are not so fine, then that university must grow sick. Money will not cure this sickness. More money will make it worse. One hears that all these and other such sins are from time to time committed by governing boards of the universities and colleges including the church colleges. The most scorching denunciation of the dishonesties of a college board which I have ever heard came from a fine old minister who was heartbroken by the doings within the board of his own church college.

"On the other hand, my belief is, that such wrongful acts as I have named are relatively rare. Nearly all the trustees whom I have known or known about, have given a service to their institutions which was most unselfish and high-minded. . . . In this connection I recall the observation of President Mees that no man is fit to be a college professor until he has been a college president. . . . In the house of the Interpreter a man in